

July 21, 2003

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 03-125-(3)
PETITIONER: REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
SAWTELLE ZONED DISTRICT NO. 124
THIRD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission to approve Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3).
2. Determine that the Regional Planning Commission's recommendation is compatible with and supportive of the goals of the Los Angeles County General Plan.
3. Consider the Negative Declaration for Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3), together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
4. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the ordinance, to change zones within the Sawtelle Zoned District as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission in Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3).

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

- Update the zoning on the subject property to bring it into consistency with the adopted land use classifications.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

These zone changes promote the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence. The project action was carefully researched and analyzed to ensure that the proposed zones were both beneficial to property owners and responsive to public concerns.

These zone changes also promote the County's vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The approval of the zone changes will allow public review of many new, private developments in the Sawtelle District, affording the opportunity to mitigate potential congestion and other impacts in an extremely urbanized area of Los Angeles County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementation of the proposed zone change will not result in any new significant costs to the County or to the Department of Regional Planning and, therefore, no request for financing is being made.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3) on June 25, 2003. The requests before the Commission were: 1) a zone change from the existing R-4 to O-S on 369.3 acres, and from the existing R-4 to IT on 148.6 acres. The Regional Planning Commission voted to approve the proposed zone changes at their July 16, 2003 meeting.

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Section 65856 of the Government Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The proposed zone changes will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the findings of the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Approval of the zone changes will not have an impact on current services.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

JEH:RDH:DC:GMN

Attachments:

1. Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission
2. Project Summary
3. Proposed Ordinance
4. Vicinity Map
5. Negative Declaration
6. Initial Study
7. Summary of Proceedings
8. Legal Notice of Board Hearing
9. List of Persons to be Notified
10. Factual

C: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Assessor
Director, Department of Public Works

**RESOLUTION
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 03-125-(3)**

WHEREAS, The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing on June 25, 2003 in the matter of Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3); and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. On February 11, 2003, the Board of Supervisors directed the Department of Regional Planning to initiate a zoning study in the Sawtelle Zoned District No. 124 ("Sawtelle District"), located in West Los Angeles.
2. The Sawtelle District is approximately 576.5 acres and is currently used for public and semi-public facilities and open space.
3. The Sawtelle District is developed with veterans' medical and recreational facilities, and armed forces and other federal government administrative facilities. A veterans cemetery is also located within the District.
4. Surrounding properties are in the City of Los Angeles and consist primarily of low- and medium-density residential uses.
5. The Sawtelle District is currently zoned R-4 (Unlimited Residence Zone). This zoning was established in 1960.
6. The surrounding community is zoned predominantly zoned Low- and Medium-density Residential, with a small amount of General Commercial zoning.
7. The Sawtelle District is located within the Open Space and Public and Semi-Public Facilities land use categories on the Land Use Policy Map of the Countywide General Plan.
8. Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3) would result in changes of zone for the Sawtelle District from R-4 (Unlimited Residence Zone) to O-S (Open-Space Zone)(O-S) and IT (Institutional Zone)(IT).
9. The proposed zone changes were subject to citizen review at a meeting held on March 27, 2003, in written correspondence, and at the public hearing.
10. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning of the Sawtelle District in that the surrounding community has completely urbanized since the zoning was

established for the District, the zoning is not compatible with the surrounding community, and the zoning is not consistent with the General Plan land use categories, which were adopted twenty years after the zoning was established.

11. A need for the proposed O-S and IT zone classifications exists within the District to better match in that the proposed zoning classifications reflect and protect the existing land uses, to which meet the surrounding community's need for open space areas, and to provide veterans services to a population that is often would otherwise be underserved.
12. The Sawtelle District is a proper location for the proposed O-S and IT zoning classifications as the proposed zoning reflects, and is compatible with, existing uses in the District open space and institutional uses in the District are compatible and integrated with the uses in the surrounding area and are adequately served by existing streets and highways and by other necessary service facilities.
13. Placement of the proposed O-S and IT zones at the proposed location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice, in that zoning will be made consistent with the adopted land use categories of the area, will be compatible with the zoning of the surrounding community, and current existing land uses within the Sawtelle District will be protected and encouraged.
14. The proposed zone changes from R-4 to O-S and IT are consistent with, compatible with, and supportive of the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan to make zoning conform to the adopted plan.
15. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Commission, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
16. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the proposed changes of zone will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board of Supervisors hold a public hearing to consider the recommended changes in zone from R-4 to O-S and IT for Sawtelle Zoned District No. 124, which consists of Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3).
2. That the Board of Supervisors certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration and determine that Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3) will not have a significant effect on the environment.
3. That the Board of Supervisors find the recommended zoning is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan.
4. That the Board of Supervisors find that the public convenience, the general welfare and good zoning practice justify the recommended changes of zone.
5. That the Board of Supervisors adopt the above recommended changes of zone, changing the zoning classification in the Sawtelle District as described above.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on July 16, 2003.

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION : Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3) to bring zoning in the Sawtelle Zoned District consistent with the adopted General Plan land use categories

REQUEST : Adopt Zone Change No. 03-125-(3)

LOCATION : West Los Angeles (Third Supervisorial District)

STAFF CONTACT : Mr. Dave Cowardin at (213) 974-6422.

RPC HEARING DATE : June 25, 2003

RPC RECOMMENDATION : Board hearing and adoption of proposed zone changes

MEMBERS VOTING AYE : Bellamy, Helsley, Rew, and Modugno

MEMBERS NOT VOTING : Valadez

KEY ISSUES : Zone Change Case No. 03-125-(3) will make the zoning consistent with the Plan land use categories

MAJOR POINTS FOR : Zone changes are part of the zoning consistency program identified by the General Plan as critical action for implementation, as well as required by State law

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST : None

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: ZC 03-125-03

1. **DESCRIPTION:**

Zoning changes to ensure that zoning designations for property are in conformance with the land use categories of the adopted Los Angeles County General Plan. This is necessary, by law, to eliminate potential conflicts between the Plan and the zoning designations. The Plan established land uses in the Sawtelle District which made inconsistent the previously adopted zoning. Residential zoning will be replaced with either Open-Space or Institutional zoning.

2. **LOCATION:**

Unincorporated area in the Sawtelle District, West Los Angeles, divided by the San Diego Freeway (405) and Wilshire Boulevard.

3. **PROPONENT:**

County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street 13th Floor
Los Angeles CA 90012

4. **FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. **LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Gina M. Natoli, AICP
DATE: April 23, 2003

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECTNUMBER: 03-125

CASES: ZC03-125



* * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: Not Applicable Staff Member: Gina M. Natoli, AICP

Thomas Guide: 631 and 632 USGS Quad: Beverly Hills

Location: Unincorporated area in the Sawtelle District, West Los Angeles, divided by the San Diego Freeway and Wilshire Boulevard, generally bounded by Bingham Avenue/San Vicente Boulevard to the west, Ohio Avenue to the south, Veteran Avenue to the east, and Chayote Street to the north.

Description of Project: Zoning change to bring zoning consistent with the adopted General Plan and to ensure future private development is compatible with and sensitive to existing and surrounding uses.

Gross Area: 576.5 acres

Environmental Setting: The Sawtelle District properties contain various federal office and maintenance buildings, theaters, US Army Reserve and California National Guard facilities, Veterans Affairs medical facilities, veterans housing, and a cemetery. The surrounding area is urban and developed. The majority of the surrounding City of Los Angeles area is zoned for residential use.

Zoning: R-4 Unlimited Residence

General Plan: Open Space, Public and Semi-Public Facilities (OS, P)

Community/Area Wide Plan: Not Applicable

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u>	<u>Special</u> <u>Reviewing</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> None
	<u>Agencies</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns Area
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base	
<input type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.	<u>County Reviewing Agencies</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CA Dept of Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>City of Los Angeles</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee
<u>Trustee Agencies</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>US Dept. of Veterans Affairs</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> DPW: _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>US General Services Admin</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Services: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>US Dept. of the Army</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<u>Regional Significance</u>	

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for			
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No		
			Less than Significant Impact with		Potentially Significant Impact
					Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Cultural	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mineral	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

*

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: Applicable only to individual development projects.

2. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Gina M. Natoli, AICP Date: 04/13/2003

Approved by: David Cowardin Date: 05/14/2003

- ☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.
- ☒ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
The Santa Monica Fault is believed to run just south of the project area.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
The area contains small Very-Low liquefaction, earthquake-induced landslide, and shallow groundwater areas.
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?

- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Specific developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?

<u>A dashed line stream runs through the northwest corner of the project area.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A (Floodways) | <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance No. 12,114 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW | |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Design |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Specific developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant project mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with |
|---|---|---|

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? _____
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? _____
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

There is an existing oil lease facility on parcel 4365-008-903
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Specific developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?

San Diego Freeway (405)

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
-
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
-
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____
-

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778
Chapter 35

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Specific developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

- ☐ ☒ ☐ If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?
-
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?
-
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____
-

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts. Any future developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant with project mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/No impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than |

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?
-
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
-

d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?

There is an existing oil lease facility on parcel 4365-008-903.

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors: _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

The oil lease is an existing use. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts. Any future developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant with project mitigation significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant ☒ Less than significant

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain a major riparian or other

sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Oak Tree Permit ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

This section is not applicable. No identified sensitive resources are known to exist in the project area.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☐ Potentially significant with project mitigation significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

The area was certainly occupied by prehistoric persons, but no resources have been identified.

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

Two structures are listed National Historic Landmark buildings, and a dozen are eligible.

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase I Archaeology Report

Specific developments will be submitted to the County for approval and will receive a more detailed analysis. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

This section is not applicable. The proposed project site contains no known mineral resources.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than



RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

This section is not applicable. There is no designated farmland within the planning area.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than
impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? _____

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
-
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
-
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
-
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
-
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
-
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____
-

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
☐ Project Design with Traffic & Lighting Division ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant with project mitigation significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create student transportation problems?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant with project mitigation significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant with project mitigation significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an

inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in a major change in the patterns,

scale, or character of the general area or community?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant
with project mitigation
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant
☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

<u>Medical hazards and waste; possibly munitions at the military facilities.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

_____ |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

_____ |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant

project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

- c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
- ☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?
- ☐ ☒ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?
- ☐ ☒ ☐ Other? _____
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will bring zoning into consistency with the plan designations. Neither of the referenced Criteria apply to the project area.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local

population projections?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This section is not applicable. The proposed zoning changes will lower densities and will have no adverse impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially

reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
-

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than
significant with project mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than
significant/No impact	

SUMMARY OF RPC PROCEEDINGS

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 03-125-(3)

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing on June 25, 2003 to consider zone changes to the Sawtelle Zoned District (District). The District is the unincorporated area located in the Third Supervisorial District bounded by San Vicente Blvd./Federal Ave. and Barrington Ave. to the west, Chayote St. to the north, Veteran Ave. to the east, and Ohio Ave. to the south.

Notice of public hearing was published in "The Daily Breeze" and "La Opinion." Additionally, notices were sent to every property owner in the District and within a 500-foot radius of the subject properties,

as well as those individuals and organizations on the Department's courtesy mailing lists. The draft zone changes; staff report; maps of the existing land use categories and zoning; and environmental documentation were made available at the following locations:

Department of Regional Planning office, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1356, Los Angeles

Department website, <http://planning.co.la.ca.us/smmnap>

West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library, 11360 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles

Donald Bruce Kaufman-Brentwood Branch Library, 11820 San Vicente Blvd., Los Angeles

Los Angeles County Law Library, 9355 Burton Way #400, Beverly Hills

June 25, 2003

Staff presented the proposed zone changes. This project was developed directly from the land use categories established by the Countywide General Plan (Plan), which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1980. Staff met with District property owners and users on March 17, 2003 at the VA Medical Center in the District. The recommendations for zone changes were developed by comparing the adopted land use categories with existing uses to determine the most consistent zones, and by taking into consideration existing uses in the surrounding community.

Five persons testified at the hearing and expressed their opinions on several aspects of the zone changes. The following summarizes this testimony and RPC discussion:

Four persons testified in favor of the zone changes and one in opposition. Testifiers in favor expressed their support of the zone changes, understanding that zoning must be consistent with the General Plan. Testifiers in favor were particularly supportive of preserving the District's open space and of restricting future residential development. The testifier in opposition was mainly concerned about incompatible uses locating across from his residence, believing that the Institutional zone allows virtually unrestricted uses.

Staff responded that the Institutional zone is in fact much more restrictive than the Open-Space zone.

There was no discussion by the RPC.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

SAWTELLE ZONED DISTRICT ZONE CHANGE

Notice is hereby given that the Board of Supervisors will conduct a public hearing concerning the proposed zone change on August 26, 2003 at 9:30 a.m., in Room 381, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. Interested persons will be given an opportunity to testify. The Negative Declaration associated with this project will also be considered.

ZONE CHANGE PROPOSAL:

1. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-125-(3):** A zoning consistency program will involve zone changes for much of the area, from R-4 (Unlimited Residence) to O-S (Open Space) and IT (Institutional).

2. **OTHER:** Such other amendments and changes that, in the opinion of the Board of Supervisors, should be considered at this time.

LOCATION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY: The Sawtelle Zoned District is located in west Los Angeles, bisected by the San Diego Freeway (405) and Wilshire Boulevard.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, staff has determined that the proposed zoning consistency ordinance will not result in a physical change in or cause any harm to the physical environment. Accordingly, staff recommends the proposed item may receive a Negative Declaration under the provisions of CEQA and County guidelines.

If you are unable to attend the public hearing but wish to submit written comments, please send them to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors, Room 383, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

If the final decision on these proposals is challenged in court, testimony may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or by written correspondence delivered to the Board at or prior to the public hearing.

Copies of the proposed zone changes, related documents, and the environmental documentation will be available for review at these locations:

- Dept. of Regional Planning website: <http://planning.co.la.ca.us>
- Dept. of Regional Planning office: Monday-Thursday (**closed on Fridays**) from 7:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.


Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1356,
Los Angeles

- West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library, 11360 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles
- Donald Bruce Kaufman-Brentwood Branch Library, 11820 San Vicente Blvd., Los Angeles
- Los Angeles County Law Library, 9355 Burton Way #400, Beverly Hills

Additional information may be obtained by telephoning the Community Studies II Section at (213) 974-6422 between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday. **Our offices are closed on Fridays.**

"Este es un aviso de una audiencia pública de acuerdo al Decreto de la Protección de Medio Ambiente de California. El proyecto de "Sawtelle Zoned District" sera considerado, por el Condado de Los Angeles, para Cambios de Zonas. La audiencia publica se llevara acabo el dia 26 Agosto del 2003 a las 9:30 de la mañana, en el salon de juntas 381 localizado en el Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, California. Si necesita mas información o quiere este aviso en Español, favor de llamar al Departamento de Planificación al numero (213) 974-6466."

ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Coordinator at (213) 974-6488 (Voice) or (213) 617-2292 (TDD), with at least five business days notice.

 <p>Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles California 90012 Telephone (213) 974-6443 PROJECT No. 03-125-(3) Zone Change</p>	RPC/HO MEETING DATE	CONTINUE TO
	6-25-03	
	AGENDA ITEM No. 9	
	PUBLIC HEARING DATE June 25, 2003	
APPLICANT County of Los Angeles	OWNER Various	REPRESENTATIVE
REQUEST Zone changes to make zoning consistent with adopted General Plan land use categories.		
LOCATION/ADDRESS West Los Angeles Area of the Third Supervisory District bounded by Chayote		ZONED DISTRICT Sawtelle District No. 124

Street on the north, Ohio Avenue on the south, Veteran Avenue on the east and Federal Avenue/Bringham Avenue on the west, excluding the City of Los Angeles		COMMUNITY None	
ACCESS: San Diego Freeway (405), Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard (US Route 66/State Highway 2), Sepulveda Boulevard		EXISTING ZONING R-4	
SIZE 576.5 Acres	EXISTING LAND USE OS, P	SHAPE Irregular	TOPOGRAPHY Varies
SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING North: Mainly Residential and Commercial (City of Los Angeles)		East: Mainly Residential and Commercial (City of Los Angeles)	
South: Mainly Residential and Commercial (City of Los Angeles)		West: Mainly Residential and Commercial (City of Los Angeles)	
GENERAL PLAN	DESIGNATION	MAXIMUM DENSITY	CONSISTENCY
COUNTYWIDE	Open Space, Public and Semi-Public Facilities	Not Applicable	Yes
AREA PLAN	Not Applicable		
ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS Negative Declaration (3)			
DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN The subject area varies from hilly to relatively flat land. The 576.5-acre project area is mainly comprised of open space, institutional, and public and semi-public uses. A highly urbanized portion of the City of Los Angeles surrounds the District. The project is located west of downtown Los Angeles between the cities of Santa Monica and Beverly Hills.			
KEY ISSUES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board of Supervisors adopted the Sawtelle District in November 1960. The Los Angeles Countywide General Plan was adopted in 1980. The proposed zone changes, Case No. ZC 03-125, will make the zoning consistent with the Plan land use categories. <i>(If more space is required, use opposite side of sheet.)</i>			

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFF CONTACT PERSON DAVID COWARDIN, COMMUNITY STUDIES II, 213/974-6422		
RPC HEARING DATE (S) 6-25-03	RPC ACTION DATE 6-25-03	RPC RECOMMENDATION APPROVE
MEMBERS VOTING AYE BELLAMY, HELSLEY, REW, MODUGNO (VALADEZ ABSENT)	MEMBERS VOTING NO NONE	MEMBERS ABSTAINING
STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING) APPROVE		
SPEAKERS* (O) 1 (F) 4	PETITIONS (O) (F)	LETTERS [TELEPHONE CALLS] (O) 2 (F) 5 [5]

*(O) = Opponents (F) = In

